



With the support of



Climate Change, Energy and Ecosystems: Creating links to better manage climate change impacts Building capacity to influence climate change policy

***International seminar 6-8th May 2008
Hotel Mandé, Bamako, Mali***



For the first time, the nature conservation organizations of IUCN (International Union for Conservation of Nature) met with climate, energy, and development networks to find joint solutions to environmental problems in West and Central Africa. In partnership with HELIO International, Mali Folkecenter – Nyetaa, HELIO Afrique, ENDA (Environmental Development Action in the Third World), Climate Action Network–France (CAN) and the Nicolas Hulot Foundation (FNH), with the support of the Italian Cooperation (DGCS), IUCN organized a capacity building workshop on the issues of energy and climate change from the 6 – 8th May in Bamako, Mali.

More than 40 participants from 15 African countries, representing 6 governments and 6 other NGOs, met with the aim of discussion two main issues:

- how can ecosystems adapt to climate change to provide vital energy services?
- How can African countries influence the international climate negotiations and present common positions?

Overall the participants were very satisfied with the interactive workshop, which included a visit to a jatropha project for small-scale biofuel production in southern Mali. The only complaint was there not being not enough time in the day for all the discussions!

Potential areas for collaboration and action plans were identified for the rest of 2008, including a joint workshop at the World Conservation Congress in Barcelona, October 2008 and the presentation of African positions with a publication and a side event at the UN Climate Change negotiations in Poznan in December 2008.

The results can be found at: <http://www.ccee-bamako.org>.

It is hoped to hold similar workshops in other regions to help build IUCN's regional capacity to deliver on the new programme from 2009 to 2012.

Contacts:

Elise Buckle (on climate issues)

Nadine McCormick (on energy issues)

BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES

The impacts of climate change are already seriously impacting on the environment and therefore societies that depend on natural resources, in particular the poorest and most vulnerable communities. In the face of such challenges, a collective conscience is growing for the need to integrate adaptation in development projects, in the management of ecosystems and in planning for increased access to energy services.

In parallel, the political agenda of international negotiations on a post-2012 multilateral agreement is accelerating. The next two years will be crucial for deciding the future of the Kyoto Protocol and the United Nations Convention on Climate Change. Developing countries have an important role to play in terms of influencing the decisions that will be taken on the reduction of greenhouse gases (mitigation), adaptation, technology transfer and finances.

This seminar aimed to:

- Share expertise, practical experience and tools in order to understand the **factors of climate change vulnerability**, and the possible **responses for integrating adaptation into development projects, ecosystem management and access to energy**; and from this develop some concrete adaptation projects:
- Understand and share knowledge on the **issues at stake in international climate change negotiations**; and from this knowledge, develop and **reinforce the capacity of developing countries to formulate recommendations and influence the next negotiations** of for the next UNFCCC negotiations in Poznan (2008).
- **Expand and connect existing networks**, between the members of the HELIO network, the francophone NGO members of the Climate Action Network (CAN) and ENDA, the Ad-Hoc working group of Coordination SUD on climate and development linked with ENDA and CAN, and the network of IUCN members and staff who work in West and Central Africa on the management of ecosystems and eco-development, in order to exchange knowledge on best practices and to build stakeholder capacity for advocacy.

PARTNERS AND PARTICIPANTS

This workshop was organized by:

- IUCN (International Union for Conservation of Nature) and its regional office for West and Central Africa (PACO);
- The network on energy systems of HELIO International and HELIO Africa;
- The network of francophone NGOs for climate change (ENDA based in Dakar and CAN-France), created in 2007 to demonstrate advocacy at the Bali COP, with the support of a speaker from the Nicolas Hulot Foundation.

More than 40 participants came from 15 countries from Western and Central Africa, including 6 governmental representatives and 6 other NGOs.

PRESENTATION OF RESULTS AT BARCELONA AND POZNAN

The results of the workshop will be compiled in a report based on the practical solutions and political recommendations formulated by the participants, which will be presented at the World Conservation Congress in Barcelona (5-10th October 2008) and at the 14th United Nations International Conference on Climate Change in Poznan (2-12th December 2008).

REPORT

To consult full presentations, please check: <http://www.ccee-bamako.org/>

Introduction

The introduction was aimed reminding the objectives and the agenda of the workshop, presenting the networks and participants, and asking the participants about their expectations.

IUCN gave a presentation about climate change, the international negotiations, and the Bali roadmap and its implications for developing countries.

HELIO introduced the energy session by presenting the basic notions about adaptation, energy resilience, the effects of climate change on energy systems, the contribution of renewable energies to energy resilience and the methods for assessing vulnerability to climate change.

The international negotiations on climate change

The Climate Action Network presented the work that was done in 2007, with the publication presenting the positions of francophone NGOs about energy, forests, and adaptation, which was then presented during a side event with the African negotiators at the COP in Bali in December 2007.

The network is now wider as IUCN and HELIO are involved and a new publication will be prepared in 2008, including energy, mitigation, and finance.

Climate change mitigation and the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions (CAN)

The impacts of climate change are already being felt with a global temperature increase of +0.74°C, causing global warming, species extinctions, sea level rise and negative health impacts. Global warming needs to be limited to +2°C compared to pre-industrial levels, which means that emissions will have to peak by 2050. This implies that industrialized countries need to reduce their emissions by 25 to 40% by 2020, and 80 to 95% by 2050, and developing countries will need to stabilize their emissions.

In Bali, three tracks have been discussed:

- the Working Group for setting emission reduction targets, the track of industrialized countries that ratified Kyoto;
- the US track, with or without set emission targets;
- the developing countries track with appropriate national actions enabled by technology transfer, finance and capacity-building, with emission reduction targets only if developed countries would provide them with the necessary support.

The post-2012 agreement needs to take into account development and North-South equity issues.

NGOs were very critical towards to the US approach as it does not necessarily include clear commitments. The voice of developing countries is legitimate, given the equity issue. Commitments also need to be differentiated depending on the very different level of development in the large group of developing and emerging countries.

The overall objective in Copenhagen is to come to an agreement that would reconcile the three tracks discussed.

The concept of « Greenhouse Right Development » can be used to measure the necessary effort required by each country depending on its ability to act on climate change. According to this tool, developed countries should contribute to 78% of the costs implied by climate change, given their income and population, whereas the Least Developed Countries would contribute to 0% of the costs.

The situation is now changing very quickly, China being the biggest emitter in the world in 2007. Some emerging countries are now in the category of Annex I countries. The countries grouped in the G77 have very different levels of development.

The criteria used to differentiate among countries are :

- historical responsibility (amount of greenhouse gas emitted in the past)
- capacity (income)
- potential for reduction (available technologies, etc...)

Using these criteria, 4 categories can be defined among developing countries : newly industrialized countries (e.g. : Korea), fast-growing countries (e.g. : China), other developing countries (India, Nigeria), and Least Developed Countries (Mali). These classifications could evolve with the time. There could be set emission reduction targets for the first two categories, and for the last two categories, some qualitative rather than quantitative targets implemented with the support of developed countries.

This means that there will be negotiations inside the block of the G77 countries.

Recommendations proposed :

1. Objectives of greenhouse gas emission cuts for industrialized countries by 2020 compared to 1990 levels

- *Consistent targets with scientific recommendations from IPCC report 2007 (-25/-40% by 2020 compared to 1990).*
- *Integrate the Principle of Precaution : asking for 40% by 2020 compared to 1990, for Annex I countries*

2. Need for differentiated approaches and objectives in the group of emerging and developing countries

- *Need for different commitments according to equity criteria based on responsibility, capacity and potentiality to reduce greenhouse gas emissions*

Clean Development Mechanism (CAN)

The Clean Development Mechanism was supposed to facilitate the transfer of clean technologies towards developing countries. However it was mostly a failure: according to a recent WWF study, 40% only of the projects implemented under the CDM were providing additional emission cuts; others would have happened anyway, without the CDM. Moreover, only 3% of the projects implemented under the CDM took place in Africa, and 59% in Asia, with a very unequal geographical balance.

It is also difficult to clearly measure the contribution of MDP to sustainable development. According to many International NGOs, CDM is bringing little benefits to local populations.

Le MDP actuellement n'est pas un instrument équitable, il faut donc sans doute trouver d'autres mécanismes pour l'accord post-2012. We can then ask ourselves if CDM should be kept as it is, or if only the best CDM projects should continue to be implemented, or if the mechanism should be reformed.

It is necessary to reinforce the capacities of developing countries to facilitate their access to this kind of mechanisms. Administrative procedures requested to submit project proposal to the UN should also be simplified.

One of the reasons why CDM has not been successfully implemented in Africa is also that Africa is polluting and emitting less greenhouse gas, compared to other continents. There is then less gain to be made, and less incentives to invest in African countries, compared to India or Brazil, where the potential gain is a lot higher. The process being long, complex and costly, it exceeds the capacities of most African countries and the costs outweigh the gains. Africa should also be better represented in the CDM executive committee.

CDM needs to be reformed to reinforce the additionally test, reinforce the social and environmental standards ("Gold Standard"), and enhance efficient sectoral policies (e.g. public transports).

Recommendations proposed :

1. Reforming the CDM

- *Capacity-building for developing countries to access CDM*
- *Developing sectoral/programmatic CDM or regional CDM*
- *Simplifying the process and administrative burden (objective : to lower the costs of the long-lasting procedure for validating the projects)*
- *Disseminating a better information on the process*
- *Identify and address obstacles to investments*
- *Technical and financial support for project development*
- *Stronger presence of developing countries in the CDM Executive Committee*

2. Developing other instruments for poverty reduction in developing countries

- *Develop new sources of funding with a special fund for the clean development of developing countries (additional funds for energy security and renewable energies)*
- *Integrate climate change consideration in public development aid*
- *Technology transfer is a priority!*

REDD/Avoided deforestation (FNH)

Deforestation accounts for about 18% of greenhouse gas emissions and forests play a crucial role for biodiversity and ecosystem goods and services for local communities, especially in poor countries located in the tropical and subtropical areas.

REDD was integrated in the Bali Action Plan but the mechanisms for effective implementation are still to be decided. Forest degradation was also taken into account.

REDD is raising lots of important issues, such as governance, methodologies for carbon accounting and monitoring of preserved forested areas, carbon leaks, funding mechanisms (Fund or Market), access and benefit sharing, beneficiaries of the funds, and the definition itself of "forest".

Forest degradation is a key issue for almost all African countries.

The development of biofuels is also putting pressure on land-use and it can be a driver of deforestation.

Four questions were debated :

What is the definition of a forest ?

The FAO definition of forest including three criteria (land coverage, height of trees and percentage of land covered by trees) is hard to apply to all countries, each country having its own definition, and its own legislations.

A new definition is needed to address the qualitative aspects of forests (biodiversity and social values), and we need to take into account the capacity of soils for carbon sequestration.

How can be addressed the issues of governance and land tenure rights?

REDD needs to be linked to a broader framework of forest governance reform, including capacity-building for local communities, decentralization and community-based management of forests. Pilote projects need to be developed to see what works and what doesn't work, and REDD needs to integrate already well-known lessons learned about sustainable forest management.

What are the links with energy, biofuels and development ?

Biofuels should not be developed if they are causing further deforestation.

Renewable energies should be developed as a priority.

Only the degraded land that is not fertile enough for food production could be used for biofuels.

Should REDD be funded through the carbon market or through a fund?

The functioning of the carbon market is highly dependent on carbon prices, so maybe a Fund should be preferred.

Recommendations proposed :

1. Definition of forests:

- *Harmonize the definition of forests to take into account specificities of different ecosystems and degradation in REDD mechanism*
- *Use qualitative criteria*

2. Governance :

- *REDD needs to use a community-based approach to combine the benefits of carbon sequestration and local development.*
- *REDD needs to address the issue of land tenure and indigenous rights, capacity-building for local actors and NGO involvement.*

3. Biofuels and energy policy

- *Need to assess social and environmental impacts before any development of biofuels*
- *Ensure food security: need for a balance between food security, biofuel production and energy production*
- *Biofuels should not be developed when they contribute to deforestation*

4. Financial mechanism :

- *A « Fund » would be preferred to a « Market » based instrument*
- *Adapted national policies still need to be out in place to respond to the causes of deforestation (including energy and agriculture)*

Technology transfer (CAN)

Recommendations proposed :

1. Assessing needs

- *Improve needs assessment and develop training/capacity-building to assess needs*
- *Need to inform and train about the available technologies and the mechanisms for technology transfer*
- *Identify priority sectors*

2. Funding

- *Need for international support for technology transfer*
- *Identify which technologies are in the public domains, and what are the IP Rights for others*

3. Institutions

- Reinforce and improve the role of the Expert Group on Technology transfer
- Include Performance indicators of TT
- Need to be able to make recommendations and ask for new measures.
- More research on TT in developing countries and between developing countries
- Develop a framework to improve the access and development of technologies
- Around Intellectual Property Rights
- Around the access and development of technologies in « hosting » countries

4. Technology transfer for adaptation

- Need to develop a framework for the development and transfer of adaptation technologies

Adaptation (ENDA)

ENDA reminds some the key points that were discussed in Bali:

- Vulnerability assessment to set priorities
- Assessment of financial needs
- Capacity-building
- Integrating adaptation in development projects and sectoral policies
- Incentives implementing adaptation measures in particular in developing countries and island states
- Risk management and insurance
- Disaster risk vulnerability reduction
- Economic diversification for resilience
- UNFCCC catalyst role to encourage civil society, national governments and private sector to take action.

Between the Bali conference and the Bangkok meeting, Parties submitted more than 30 recommendations; the African civil society should seize this opportunity to submit more recommendations on adaptation.

The Climate Action Network proposed to :

- Set priorities so that adaptation support goes in priority to the poorest countries
- Integrate adaptation factors into development projects
- Set up a tax system similar to the CDM levy tax on other mechanisms to fund adaptation.

The Nairobi Work Programme was made of 9 programmes, mostly based on research. Developing countries were quite critical towards this Programme as a lot of money has been invested in research rather than trying to implement already well-known solutions. The Bali Action Plan is supposed to turn these recommendations into action.

The following questions were raised :

- Have the NAPAs (National Adaptation Programmes of Action) met their objectives ? Only 29 countries have submitted their NAPAs and the funds have not been received for implementation.
- Shouldn't the special Funds be attributed in priority to the poorest and the most vulnerable countries (with an index of vulnerability, e.g. Maldives project)
- Should there be a specific IPCC report and body looking more closely at the vulnerability aspects of the poorest countries; should there be a specific adaptation research centre?
- Should an index of responsibility be established to implement the "polluter pays" principle?
- Should local governments be represented in the international negotiations ?

- Should there be an Adaptation Protocol, separate to the comprehensive post-Kyoto agreement? or will it disperse energy and slow down the negotiations ?

There should be more synergies and interactions between the different Rio Conventions and in particular to address the issue of desertification (e.g: Niger, climate change and desertification are two issues closely linked).

Adaptation should be top priority during the negotiations and should not remain a marginal issue.

An Adaptation Protocol could be a long-term goal but on the short term it should be part of a comprehensive post-2012 agreement to avoid slowing down the negotiating process.

Recommendations proposed :

1. Need to mobilize public opinion to involve social movements and the populations that are the most affected by climate change impacts

2. Need to respect the existing clauses on adaptation

3. National Adaptation Plans (NAPAs)

- *Need to increase the level of funding and to accelerate to process for the transfer of funds to move faster to the implementation phase.*
- *Local communities need to be more consulted and better associated to the the design and implementation of NAPAs to better answer their needs*
- *Most vulnerable communities need to able to implement the measures themselves.*
- *Need to learn and exchange about lessons learned to use successful examples and facilitate the implementation of PANA in the countries that don't have a PANA yet.*

4. Adaptation and development:

- *Need to integrate adaptation and climate change considerations into existing development projects and programmes funded by international donors and cooperations*
- *Need to simulate and assess climate change impacts and to adapt the original projects taking into account these impacts*
- *Need to integrate adaptation into sectoral policies implemented by developing countries, and to integrate climate change aspects in the Environmental Impact Assessments conducted at the project level*
- *Integrate the climate change aspect in the Strategic Documents for Poverty Reduction elaborated by developing countries for the World Bank and the IMF as a condition for the poorest countries to reduce their debts.*

Finance (ENDA)

ENDA presented the different funding mechanisms for adaptation. Now the access the different funds is strictly regulated with some criteria that make the access to these funds very difficult for developing countries.

The coherence between the existing funds should be improved under the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol, rather than dispersing energy for developing new funds

Funds for local communities (e.g. GEF « small grant program ») work well, when implemented with local communities but the level of funding is too low.

It is urgent to fund the implementation of NAPAs, more quickly through bilateral cooperation as the Adaptation Fun is not yet operational. New funding mechanisms are also needed, with some possible extension of the existing levy tax on CDM.

Recommendations proposed:

NB: this part is only about Finance for Adaptation; other financial aspects related to Technology transfer, Mitigation or Forests are addressed in the other parts

- 1. Need for more coherence between the different Funds:** *need to improve the existing funds under the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol rather than dispersing our energy in setting up new funds*
- 2. Need to give more weight to the Funds targeted to local communities,** *including the Small Grant programme from the GEF; need for more funds for these mechanisms and simplifies process for accessing the grants*
- 3. Need for more funds for the NAPAs activities,** *including through bilateral cooperations, while the Adaptation Fund is not fully operational*
- 4. Need for new funding mechanisms and additional funding:** *Need to increase the level of funding for the Adaptation Fund with the extension of the 2% levy tax on other flexible mechanisms under the Kyoto Protocol*
- 5. Need to consider the idea of setting up an international tax to fund adaptation**

Action plan

15 May- 23 June	Dissemination of draft recommendations to the networks and finalisation of positions with thematic leads	Dissemination to focal points and French and Anglophone African negotiators : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cotonou meeting(CLAC) June-08 •Preparation of francophone negotiators (COP/MOP) oct - Conakry •Meeting of African focal points (13-15 mai) Dakar •CAN Equity summit - Oct 2008
23 June- 30 August	Writing of publication <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •10 pages max. /theme •Technical arguments •Practical exemples and case-studies (box) •Policy recommendations •4 p summary 	
30 August - 15 September	Editing, design / english translation	
25 Sept	Presentation at the Bobigny meeting (TBC)	
7-9 Oct	Presentation at the IUCN – World Conservation Congress in Barcelona + Press conference (TBC)	
1-12 dec	Poznan – Conference of the Parties Dissemination : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Liaison Bulletin on Energy and Environment (IEPF) •Side-Event IUNC-RAC-ENDA (TBC) / Participation to Side-Event IEPF •Eco / E-Bulletin ENDA 	

Coordination : Morgane RAC-F morgane@rac-f.org

Thematic focal points :

- Mitigation : Morgane, RAC-F morgane@rac-f.org
- Deforestation : Benoit, FNH, b.faraco@fnh.org, Sylvain, Amis de la Terre, foret@amisdelaterre.org
- Technology transfer : Anne, GRET, chetaille@gret.org
- Adaptation : Moussa, ENDA, enda.energy@orange.sn
- Finance : Djimingué, ENDA enda.energy@orange.sn

New initiatives for the IUCN Programme on climate change

The objectives of the IUCN Programme on climate change are:

- the integration of biodiversity aspects into climate change policy and practice
- the integration of climate change aspects in natural resource management.

Some key examples of IUCN's work on climate change include REDD (Forest programme, with a strong presence in Eastern Africa), ecosystem resilience and management tools against coral reef bleaching (Marine programme), adaptation of water management (Water programme, e.g. Pangani river in Tanzania), "Mangroves for the Future" in Asia.

The CRiSTAL tool (Community Risk indicator Tool for Adaptation of Livelihoods) was presented in the context of its implementation in Mali.

The tool can be accessed through IUCN's website:

<http://www.iucn.org/climate> (end of the page, right-hand corner).

New ideas were exchanged to implement the IUCN regional Programme on climate change in Central and Western Africa.

The following key priority areas were selected: REDD and forests, adaptation, ecosystem resilience and capacity-building for the civil society and governments.

4 pilot projects were then discussed in groups for developing new partnerships between IUCN and the other organizations represented at the workshop:

- the use of the CRiSTAL tool and of the adaptation tools developed by ENDA to improve water resource management in Niger;
- the development of a Carbon Fund for forest conservation in Central Africa;
- the development of a monitoring centre to collect data on climate change impacts on ecosystems and water systems;
- the development of capacity-building programme for local NGOs and local governments and for raising public awareness about climate change.